

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application identified in caption in light of the remarks which follow is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10-12, 14, 16-18 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by International Publication No. WO 03/034104 (*WO '104*). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

*WO '104* does not disclose particles having an average particle diameter of not smaller than 80% of the thickness of the hard coat layer are substantially monodisperse, in combination with other aspects recited in claim 1, and a particle in the hard coat layer which satisfies a relationship represented by the formula (1):  $0 \mu\text{m} \leq d_{\text{Max}} - d_{\text{AC}} \leq 7 \mu\text{m}$ , as recited in claim 11. Concerning such claimed particles, the Patent Office has relied on *WO '104* for disclosing the use of MX300 beads available from Soken Chemical & Engineering Co., Ltd. in Example 5 at page 56. Specifically, the Patent Office has taken the position that *WO '104* at page 13, lines 4-9, discloses that the MX300 beads are monodisperse. See Official Action at page 11. Such excerpt of *WO '104* is reproduced below:

The transparent fine particles (41) and (42) may be mono-dispersed organic or inorganic particles. The sizes of the particles are preferably uniform. If so, the scattering characters of the particles are almost the same, and accordingly the haze is easily controlled.

Respectfully, such excerpt contains no explicit teaching that the MX300 beads are monodisperse. Rather, what is disclosed is one embodiment in which the transparent fine particles "may be mono-dispersed organic or inorganic particles." This does not necessarily mean that the MX300 particles employed in Example 5 of *WO '104* are monodisperse.

As discussed in connection with the examples set forth in Applicant's disclosure, exemplary embodiments (e.g., Example Sample 1) employed MX-300 beads which were subjected to classification to adjust the cut point value thereof, whereas MX-300 beads (e.g., Comparative Sample 1) were employed which were not subjected to additional classification. See pages 71-72 and 78-79. As can be seen from Table 1 at page 81, the classification and non-classification of the MX-300 beads resulted in different cut point values of the coarse particles. Therefore, it is far from certain that MX-300 beads without additional classification, as employed in Example 5 of *WO '104*, constitute particles which are substantially monodisperse as recited in claim 1, or a particle which satisfies a relationship represented by the formula (1):  $0 \mu\text{m} \leq d_{\text{Max}} - d_{\text{AC}} \leq 7 \mu\text{m}$ , as recited in claim 11.

Furthermore, it is noted that the cut point value of coarse particles of Comparative Sample 1, which employed MX-300 beads without additional classification, was greater than 4D. See Table 1 at page 81. This is clearly outside the range recited in claim 1, in which a cut point value of coarse particles in the hard coat layer is less than 4 times the thickness of the hard coat layer.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the above §102 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *WO '104* and further in view of a JPO website machine translation of Japanese Patent Document No. 10-268111. Claims 9 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *WO '104*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,195 (*Nelson*). For the reasons discussed above, *WO '104* does not disclose or suggest particles having an average particle diameter which are substantially

monodisperse in combination with other aspects recited in claim 1, and a particle in the hard coat layer which satisfies a relationship represented by the formula (1):  $0 \mu\text{m} \leq d_{\text{Max}} - d_{\text{AC}} \leq 7 \mu\text{m}$ , as recited in claim 11. It would not have been obvious to the ordinarily skilled artisan to modify the applied documents to arrive at the claimed particle characteristics. Accordingly, withdrawal of the above §103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: March 10, 2009

By:



Roger H. Lee  
Registration No. 46317

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620